UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/609,348	06/27/2003	Fred W. Balsiger	13768.409	8232

47973 7590 07/12/2007
WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER	
TECKLU, ISAAC TUKU	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2192	
MAIL DATE	**DELIVERY MODE**
07/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/609,348	BALSIGER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Isaac T. Tecklu	2192	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 May 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-43* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-43* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment 05/02/2007.
2. Claims 1, 9, 19, 27 and 37 have been amended.
3. New claim 43 has been amended.
4. Claims 1-43 have been reexamined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Van Leersum (US 2003/0174168 A1).

As per claim 1, Van Leersum discloses in a computer system that supports a visual user interface development tool (paragraph [0021] "... providing a GUI..."), a method of centrally managing user interface state information for the visual user interface development tool such that behavior for one or more user interface components or the visual user interface development tool itself may be defined dynamically at development time (e.g. Figure 1 and related text), the method comprising acts of:

receiving a message generated within the visual user interface development tool (e.g. Figure 4, step 200 and related text);

sending the message to be checked against a centralized behavior stack for one or more behaviors to use in processing the message (paragraph [0037] "...mouse drag action has been detected ... mouse events including mouseButtonDown ..." and paragraph [0056] "... checking each associated glyph and its children to determine whether they are visible ..." and e.g. Figure 4, step 200 and related text);

checking the centralized behavior stack containing currently available behaviors for processing messages to determine if a behavior is available (paragraph [0056] "... checking each associated glyph and its children to determine whether they are visible ..." and e.g. Figure 4, step 200 and related text); and

if a behavior is available on the centralized behavior stack, then passing the message to the available behavior for processing (paragraph [0038] "... if a drag is detected then process proceeds to step 210...").

As per claim 2, Van Leersum discloses a method as recited in claim 1, wherein the behavior is available on the centralized behavior stack, and wherein the behavior is associated with the visual user interface development tool, as opposed to an individual user interface component within the visual user interface development tool (paragraph [0021] "... providing a GUI..." and paragraph [0029] "... able to create new glyphs...").

As per claim 3, Van Leersum discloses a method as recited in claim 1, wherein the behavior is available on the centralized behavior stack, and wherein the behavior is associated with an individual user interface component within the visual user interface development tool, as opposed to the visual user interface development tool itself (e.g. Figure 3 and related text).

As per claim 4, Van Leersum discloses a method as recited in claim 3, wherein the individual user interface component comprises a third party component developed separately from the visual user interface development tool (e.g. Figure 3 and related text).

As per claim 5, Van Leersum discloses a method as recited in claim 3, wherein the behavior comprises asking the individual user interface component for any glyphs that are part of the individual user interface component (e.g. Figure 7, step 450 "Glyph over parent?" and related text).

As per claim 6, Van Leersum discloses a method as recited in claim 1, further comprising acts of: receiving the behavior from a component within the visual user interface development tool during development time; and pushing the behavior on the centralized behavior stack (paragraph [0021] "... providing a GUI..." and paragraph [0029] "... able to create new glyphs...").

As per claim 7, Van Leersum discloses a method as recited in claim 1, wherein no behavior is available on the centralized behavior stack for processing the message, the method further comprising an acts of: checking for a successfully hit tested glyph with a corresponding glyph behavior for the message (paragraph [0042] "... test is performed to determine whether the glyph ..."); and if available, passing the message to the glyph behavior of the successfully hit tested glyph (paragraph [0029] "... able to create new glyphs...").

As per claim 8, Van Leersum discloses a method as recited in claim 1, further comprising an act of receiving one or more glyphs with corresponding glyph behavior from a component within the visual user interface development tool during development time, wherein each of the one or more glyphs is capable of hit testing and painting itself (paragraph [0029] "... able to create new glyphs...").

As per claim 9, this is the program product version of the claimed method discussed above (Claim 1), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Van Leersum.

As per claim 10, this is the program product version of the claimed method discussed above (Claim 3), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Van Leersum.

As per claim 11, Van Leersum discloses a computer program product as recited in claim 9, the method further comprising acts of: receiving the behavior from a component within the visual user interface development tool during development time; and pushing the behavior on the centralized behavior stack (e.g. Figure 4, step 200 and related text).

As per claim 12, Van Leersum discloses a computer program product as recited in claim 11, wherein the behavior corresponds to a particular action either being performed or to be performed on a user interface component within the visual user interface development tool, the method further comprising an act of popping the behavior off the centralized behavior stack when the particular action is completed (e.g. Figure 4, step 200 and related text).

As per claim 13, Van Leersum discloses a computer program product as recited in claim 12, wherein the centralized behavior stack enforces the existence of a single state for the particular action (e.g. Figure 4, step 200 and related text).

As per claim 14, this is the program product version of the claimed method discussed above (Claim 7), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Van Leersum.

As per claim 15, this is the program product version of the claimed method discussed above (Claim 8), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Van Leersum.

As per claim 16, Van Leersum discloses computer program product as recited in claim 9 wherein the visual user interface development tool comprises an adorner window that intercepts

all messages directed to the visual user interface development tool (e.g. glyphs illustrated in FIG. 5 and related text).

As per claim 17, Van Leersum discloses a computer program product as recited in claim 16, wherein the one or more glyphs are organized into one or more adorner layers (e.g. Figure 7 and related text).

As per claim 18, Van Leersum discloses a computer program product as recited in claim 17, the method further comprising an act of disabling at least one of the one or more adorner layers (e.g. Figure 7, step 460 and related text).

As per claim 19, this is method version of the claimed the program product discussed above (Claim 9), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Van Leersum.

As per claim 20, this is method version of the claimed the program product discussed above (Claim 10), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Van Leersum.

As per claim 21, Van Leersum discloses a method as recited in claim 19, further comprising: an act of receiving the behavior from a component within the visual user interface development tool during development time; and a step for adding the behavior to the extensible behavior store (e.g. Figure 7, step 460 and related text).

As per claim 22, this is method version of the claimed the program product discussed above (Claim 14), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Van Leersum.

As per claim 23, Van Leersum discloses a method as recited in claim 22, wherein no successfully hit test glyph with corresponding glyph behavior is available for the message.

As per claim 24, this is method version of the claimed the program product discussed above (Claim 15), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Van Leersum.

As per claim 25, Van Leersum discloses method as recited in claim 19, wherein the message comprises one of a user event, a mouse message, and a keyboard message (e.g. Figure 1 and related text).

As per claim 26, Van Leersum discloses a method as recited in claim 19, wherein the centralized and extensible behavior store contains all currently available behaviors (e.g. Figure 1 and related text).

As per claim 27, this is computer program version of the claimed the method discussed above (Claim 19), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Van Leersum.

As per claim 28, this is computer program version of the claimed the method discussed above (Claim 20), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Van Leersum.

As per claim 29, this is computer program version of the claimed the method discussed above (Claim 21), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Van Leersum.

As per claim 30, this is computer program version of the claimed the method discussed above (Claim 22), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Van Leersum.

As per claim 31, Van Leersum discloses a computer program product as recited in claim 27, wherein the behavior defines a new custom behavior previously unavailable within the visual user interface designer (e.g. Figure 4 and related text).

As per claim 32, this is computer program version of the claimed the method discussed above (Claim 24), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Van Leersum.

As per claim 33, Van Leersum discloses a computer program product as recited in claim 32, wherein the one or more glyphs are organized into one or more adorner layers (e.g. Figure 7 and related text).

As per claim 34, Van Leersum discloses a computer program product as recited in claim 33, the method further comprising an act of disabling at least one of the one or more adorner layers (e.g. Figure 4 and related text).

As per claim 35, Van Leersum discloses a computer program product as recited in claim 32, wherein the one or more glyphs comprise at least one custom glyph for the component (e.g. Figure 7 and related text).

As per claim 36, Van Leersum discloses a computer program product as recited in claim 32, wherein the message corresponds to at least one of a hit test message and a paint message (paragraph [0056] "... the PaintScreen routine...").

As per claim 37 (Currently Amended), Van Leersum discloses a computer program product comprising one or more computer readable media carrying computer executable instructions that centralizes component behavior for a visual user interface development tool and permits a component to define at development time one or more custom behaviors that are specific to the component itself or applicable the visual user interface development tool, the computer executable instructions comprising:

an extensible behavior stack that contains one or more development time specified behaviors for the visual user interface development tool or a component within the visual user interface development tool (paragraph [0039] '... drag has already been detected via the mouse handling ...");

a extensible collection of one or more adorners, each containing one or more development time specified glyphs capable hit testing and painting themselves, wherein at least one of the one or more glyphs includes a reference to a glyph behavior to invoke when a successful hit test has been determined (paragraph [0021] "... providing a GUI..." and paragraph [0029] '... able to create new glyphs..." and paragraph [0042] "... test is performed to determine whether the glyph ..."); and

a message router that routes one or more received messages generated in response to user input within a visual user the visual interface development tool to either the extensible behavior stack or the extensible collection of one or more adorners (paragraph [0030] "... using a drag-and-drop ..." and paragraph [0068] "... decrease in size and moved ..." and paragraph [0059] "... selected glyph ...").

As per claim 38, Van Leersum discloses a computer program product as recited in claim 37, the computer executable instructions further comprising an adorner window that intercepts one or more messages directed to the visual user interface development tool (paragraph [0030] "... using a drag-and-drop ..." and paragraph [0068] "... decrease in size and moved ..." and paragraph [0059] "... selected glyph ...").

As per claim 39, Van Leersum discloses a computer program product as recited in claim 37, wherein the message router routes a received user event message, a received mouse message, or a received keyboard message to the extensible behavior stack (paragraph [0030] "... using a drag-and-drop ..." and paragraph [0068] "... decrease in size and moved ..." and paragraph [0059] "... selected glyph ...").

As per claim 40, Van Leersum discloses a computer program product as recited in claim 37, wherein the message router routes a received a received hit test message or a received paint message to the extensible collection of one or more adorners (paragraph [0056] "... the PaintScreen routine...").

As per claim 41, Van Leersum discloses a computer program product as recited in claim 37, wherein the one or more adorners organize the one or more development time specified glyphs into layers which can be independently disabled and enabled (paragraph [0030] "... using a drag-and-drop ..." and paragraph [0068] "... decrease in size and moved ..." and paragraph [0059] "... selected glyph ...").

As per claim 42, Van Leersum discloses a computer program product as recited in claim 37, wherein the component within the visual user interface development tool comprises a third party component developed separately from the visual user interface development tool (e.g. Figure 3 and related text).

As per claim 42 (New), Van Leersum discloses a method as recited in claim 1, wherein the dynamically defined behavior is directly related to at least one functionality of the interface component selected from the group comprising: dragging an object, resizing an object, and selecting an object (paragraph [0030] "... using a drag-and-drop ..." and paragraph [0068] "... decrease in size and moved ..." and paragraph [0059] "... selected glyph ...").

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-43 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. See Van Leersum, art made of record.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Isaac T. Tecklu whose telephone number is (571) 272-7957. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 9:300A - 8:00P.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Isaac Tecklu
Art Unit 2192

TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER